

August 21, 2003

**TO:** IAC Members and Designees

**FROM:** Laura Eckert Johnson, Director

**PREPARED BY:** Marguerite Austin, Manager  
Recreation & Habitat Section

**SUBJECT:** Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program, FY2005  
Local Parks Category – 2<sup>nd</sup> Year List Approval  
Notebook Item #2

**SUMMARY**

Eight Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) Local Parks category acquisition projects requesting \$3,624,594 were evaluated on August 6, during an open public meeting. The results are attached for Board member consideration.

**BACKGROUND**

Under the provisions of Chapter 79A.15.050 RCW, the Local Parks category is part of the Outdoor Recreation Account and must receive twenty-five percent of the WWRP funds in the account. The category may also receive unallocated funds as determined by IAC. During the second year of the biennium, only acquisition project applications are accepted.

Utilizing IAC established criteria, projects were evaluated by a team comprised of:

Craig Calhoun, Dept. of Natural Resources	Larry Otos, Mount Vernon Parks & Recreation
Denise Nichols, Yakima Parks & Recreation	Les MacDonald, Pullman Public Works
Elyse Kane, Dept. of Fish & Wildlife	Marilyn Hyde, Kennewick
Jan Wolcott, Pierce County Parks & Recreation	Nancy Pritchett, Olympia
Kevin Choi, State Parks & Recreation	

Results of the evaluations are found in *Table 1 – WWRP, Local Parks Ranked List of Projects*. Staff is recommending approval of the list as presented.

**POST EVALUATION**

Following the evaluation meeting, several evaluators reconvened on August 14, to review the evaluation results, process and criteria. Listed below are some of the comments expressed at the follow-up meeting.

## **RESULTS**

The results for the Local Parks category were consistent with how evaluators anticipated projects would rank. As is typical, there were projects that ranked higher (and lower) than expected.

## **PROCESS**

Evaluators were very pleased with the general strength of the project proposals and the process. They liked the method used this year of asking presenters to respond to the first two questions before evaluators asked follow-up questions. They felt hearing a bit more of the presentation allowed them to ask the right questions and have a better understanding of the proposal and the significance of the project within the community.

Knowledge, clarity, conciseness and simplicity are critical to a successful project presentation. Evaluators were pleased with the quality of the presentation graphics and skillful use of PowerPoint to compliment applicant responses to the evaluation criteria.

## **EVALUATION CRITERIA**

The *Immediacy of Threat* question continues to be a challenge for evaluators. It is difficult to score and presenters seem to struggle with explaining why a particular property is at “risk” and should be given preference. Evaluators suggested that maybe IAC should consider modifying the criteria so that acquisitions have a better chance of scoring well, especially when competing with development projects.

Specifically, it was suggested that IAC reduce the multiplier on the *Immediacy of Threat* criteria. While the question is important, not as much weight would be tied to a question that is more challenging for presenters and evaluators alike. To make up the point difference, the team recommended using the *Site Suitability* criteria for acquisition projects only. This combined with a lower scoring *Immediacy of Threat* criteria could help resolve the acquisition vs. development projects scoring challenge. *Site Suitability* for development projects could be captured as another element under the *Project Design* criteria. We are not recommending changes to the evaluative criteria at this time; however, staff may propose some modifications before the next grant cycle.

## **AVAILABLE FUNDING**

The 2003-2005 biennial appropriation for the WWRP program is \$45 million. Funds are divided equally between the Outdoor Recreation Account (ORA) and the Habitat Conservation Account (HCA). By statute, twenty-five percent of the ORA is used for Local Parks<sup>1</sup> category projects. At the December 2002 IAC meeting, Board members agreed to withhold 25% of the 2003-2005 Local Parks category statutory funding for second year projects. Based on the WWRP biennial appropriation of \$45 million, \$5,625,000 was available for this category. At that meeting IAC's Board also approved

---

<sup>1</sup> By statute, fifty percent of the statutory funds in this category must be used for acquisition.

using forty percent of the ORA unallocated funds for the Local Parks category. It did not set aside any of the ORA unallocated funds for second year Local Parks projects.

As a result, there is \$1,406,250 available for distribution to the Fiscal Year (FY) 2005 WWRP Local Parks category. This chart illustrates the fund amounts approved by the Board.

<b>WWRP FUNDING ORA FOR 2003-2005</b>	<b>STATUTORY 25%</b>	<b>UNALLOCATED 40%</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
1 <sup>st</sup> Year Funding (FY04) Acq & Dev	\$4,218,750	\$2,250,000	\$6,468,750 <sup>2</sup>
2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Funding (FY05) Acq Only	\$1,406,250		\$1,406,250
Local Parks Category - Totals	\$5,625,000	\$2,250,000	\$7,875,000

### **RECOMMENDATION**

After reviewing the results of the scoring and ranking of projects, and considering comments from evaluators and applicants, staff recommends approval of the ranked list of projects as shown in Table 1. Table 1 also shows staff's recommendation for the list of projects to be forwarded to the Governor and Legislature. In keeping with IAC guidelines, this list includes enough projects to use the statutory amount set aside for this category and alternates. Resolution #2003-28 is provided for Board consideration.

Staff has provided project summaries that explain the projects' scope and properties proposed for acquisition, a state map that identifies the location of each project, and the evaluation summary.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

- ▶ Resolution #2003-28
- ▶ Table 1 – WWRP, *Local Parks Ranked List of Projects FY 2005* (2003-28)
- ▶ State Map
- ▶ Local Parks Evaluation Criteria Summary
- ▶ Project Evaluation Scoring Summary
- ▶ Individual Project Summaries with Photos

---

<sup>2</sup> At the July 2003 meeting, IAC distributed \$6,468,750 of the 2003-2005 WWRP funds to Local Parks category projects approved for FY2004 by the 2003 Legislature.

**RESOLUTION #2003-28**  
**Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program**  
**Local Parks Category - Fiscal Year 2005**  
**Ranked List of Projects**

**WHEREAS**, for fiscal year 2005, eight Local Parks category projects are eligible for funding from the Outdoor Recreation Account of the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program, and

**WHEREAS**, these eight Local Parks category acquisition projects were evaluated using evaluation criteria approved by Interagency Board members, and

**WHEREAS**, these evaluations occurred in an open public meeting, and

**WHEREAS**, all eight Local Parks category projects meet program requirements as stipulated in IAC Manual #10, Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program, and

**WHEREAS**, \$1,406,250 in funding is available for FY2005 Local Parks category projects from the \$45 million appropriated by the 2003 Legislature for the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program for the 2003-2005 biennium,

**NOW, THEREFORE IT BE RESOLVED**, that IAC hereby approves the ranked list of projects for the Local Parks category as depicted in *Table 1 – WWRP, Local Parks Ranked List of Projects (2003-28)*, and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that IAC hereby recommends to the Governor the ranked list of funded and alternate Local Parks category projects as depicted.

*Resolution moved by:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Resolution seconded by:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)*

*Date: September 11, 2003*